



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW

JULY, 1897

THE HEBREW TEXT OF ECCLESIASTICUS.

THE original Hebrew text of the Book of Sirach, from which Saadiah, a thousand years ago, made several quotations, and which was regarded as hopelessly lost, has, by the fortunate discovery of Mr. S. Schechter and Dr. Neubauer, again become—at least so far as the fifth Part (xxxix. 15–xlix. 11) is concerned—one of the recovered possessions of science.

Grateful as all feel for the discovery, we are equally thankful for the speedy appearance of the excellent edition of the fragments (Cowley and Neubauer, *The Original Hebrew of a portion of Ecclesiasticus*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1897). My present intention is to offer a contribution to their correct estimation and appreciation. In the major portion of my remarks, suggestions are made for the correction of the errors of the Hebrew text (Part III); and the *prima facie* probability is established that this text of the Book of Sirach is corrupted by a large number and variety of mistakes which, however, did not exist in the texts used by the Greek and Syriac translators, though those texts were also corrupt, as is sufficiently apparent from the exegesis of the book.

A few glaring examples, especially in the Greek version, are collated in the first part; while in the second part some misunderstandings of the Greek translator, and a few cor-

ruptions of the Greek text are pointed out, by the aid of the Hebrew original. The gaps in the Hebrew text, arising from the condition of the extant fragments, have not been supplied in the edition. But in the English translation, the editors have supplied the defects by what must, on the whole, be pronounced happy conjectures. In the fourth part I have attempted to fill the greater portion of the lacunae regarded, even in the translation, as hopeless. In the fifth and last part, I offer various remarks on the linguistics of the Hebrew text from the lexicographical point of view. This text is of the highest value for the history of the Hebrew language, and especially for the origin of the Mishna dialect. Yet, while bearing this in mind, one must not lose sight of the fact—emphasized at the beginning of the last part—that Sirach enriched his diction by consciously borrowing, for the sake of ornament, phrases from the Biblical writings.

His vocabulary and phraseology he draws from the ancient literature mainly. His plane and range of diction differs, however, from that of the later Biblical authors, who adopt the expressions of their predecessors. Sirach is the oldest example of the style that constructs sentences out of a mosaic of Biblical phrases. The quotations from the Syriac version I transcribe in Hebrew letters. On a few occasions I quote Prof. R. Smend's remarks on the edition of the text of Sirach, in the *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, 22nd year, No. 6, cols. 161–166.

I. *False readings in the original Hebrew text which the Greek translator used.*

xxxix. 26. In Hebrew, the verse 26 c is to be completed thus: וְחִלָּב חֲטִיִּים [וְחִלָּב חֲטִיִּים]. The Syriac has וְחִרְבָּא וְחֲטָא instead of וְחִרְבָּא וְחֲטָא. The Greek καὶ σμεῖδαλις πυρός, corrupted from σμεῖδαλις πυροῦ, i. e. וּסְלַח חֲטִיִּים. Cp. Ex. xxix. 3. That וְחִלָּב חֲטִיִּים is the original reading is proved not only by the agreement between the Hebrew and the Syriac versions,

but also by the fact that the next *stichos* contains the phrase דם ענב as the term for "wine," borrowed from Deut. xxxii. 14, where also occurs the expression חלב כליות חמה identical with חלב חטים Ps. cxlvii. 14.

xxxix. 28. Heb. הרים יעתיקו (cp. Job ix. 5); Syr. מורא עקין; Gk. ἐστρεψωσαν μάστιγας αὐτῶν. Corresponding somewhat to this phrase is הרים יחזיקו.

xxxix. 30d. Heb. באצרו; Gk. ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς = באצרו. Possibly the original Hebrew reading was באצרות Job xxxviii. 22.

xl. 5. Heb. אך קנאה; Gk. θυμὸς καὶ ζῆλος, i.e. אף וקנאה (also Syr. ריוגא). But אך is the correct reading. This verse belongs to ver. 1 c "From the day of his birth till his death . . . nothing but jealousy, anxiety, terror." Cp. אך טוב וחסד Ps. xxiii. 6. The editors consider אף to be the original reading and correct the Hebrew accordingly.

xl. 29 c. Combining the readings in the text and margin the Heb. would be מפש מטעמי זכר (=מעל). The Gk. read, instead of מטעמי זכר, מטעמים זרים, ἐν ἐδέσμασιν ἀλλοτρίοις. In ver. 29 d, the Greek translator read, instead of יפיר (the marginal variant), יסיר or יפיר, and rendered it πεπαιδευμένος. The Syr. has כאבא = יפיר).

xli. 11. Heb. הבל; Gk. πέθος = אָבֶל.

xli. 12. Heb. אוצרות חמדה (thus the marginal variant, not אוצרות חכמה; cp. Hos. xiii. 15, אוצר כל כלי חמדה); Gk. θησαυροὶ χρυσίου = אוצרות חרוץ.

xli. 14 a. Heb. מוסר בשת; Gk. παιδεῖαν ἐν εἰρήνῃ, i.e. מוסר בשלום.

xli. 16 c. Heb. ולא כל הכלם נבחר (parallel with לא כל בשת ולא כל לשמור); Gk. καὶ οὐ πάντα πᾶσιν ἐν πίστει εὐδοκιμῆται. He read in his text ולא הכל לכל באמונה נבחן.

xli. 18. Heb. מארון וגברת (see Ps. cxxiii. 2); Gk. ἀπὸ κριτοῦ καὶ ἀρχοντος. He read מדיין וגבור.

xli. 19 b. See Part II of these notes.

xlii. 8 d. Heb. צנוע; Gk. δεδοκιμασμένος; perhaps צרוף.

xliii. 13. Heb. תתה ברק; Gk. κατέπαυσεν χιόνα. Perhaps תחנה ברק; the verb being in the Hiphil and transitive form and ברד taken in the sense of שלג, "snow."

xlili. 19. Heb. ויצין כספיר ציצים; Gk. καὶ παγεῖσα γίνεται σκολόπων ἄκρα. Possibly ויתצב כסירי קוצים.

xlili. 21 a. Heb. יבול הרים בחרב ישיק; Gk. καταφάγεται ὄρη καὶ ἔρημον ἐκαύσει = ישיק הרים וערבה (or יכלה). יאכל (יכלה).

xlili. 21 b. Heb. ונוה, which the editors render "stateliness," their reference being Ezek. vii. 11 (נֹה). But the original reading must obviously have been יִכָּה = "he burns"; parallel to יִשֵּׁק = "he kindles, destroys by fire" in the previous passage. And from this follows naturally the Greek translation ἀποσβέσει = יכבה.

xliv. 13. Heb. זכרם; Syr. דוכרנהון; Gk. σπέρμα ἀνῶν, i.e. זרעם.

xliv. 19. Heb. דופי (the marginal variant, which is more original than the reading מום in the text); Gk. ὅμοιος = דומה.

xlvi. 1 c. Heb. בימיו; Gk. κατὰ τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ = בשמו.

xlvii. 6. Heb. בנות; Gk. ἐν μυριάσιν = ברבבות; ibid. ברבבה; Gk. ἐν εὐλογίαις Κυρίου, possibly ברכות.

xlviii. 10 d. Heb. ולהבין (Syr. ולמסברו "to instruct"); Gk. καὶ καταστήσαι = ולהבין.

xlviii. 13. Heb. ומתחתיו נברא בשרו. The editors read with the Greek translator נִבְרָא for נִבְרָא, and render the phrase "and from its place his flesh prophesied." But this is neither a clear reference to 2 Kings xiii. 21, which is already alluded to in ver. 14 b (ובמותו תמהי מעשה), nor is the use of the term נבא in this sense probable. I rather think that this passage refers to Elisha's miracle, recorded in 2 Kings iv. 34, when the prophet lay upon the dead boy and brought him back to life; the meaning would be "and under him the flesh was recreated." For נברא in this sense see Ps. civ. 30 תשלח רוחך יבראון "Thou sendest forth thy spirit, they are recreated." Instead of בשרו, the reading should be בשר. The Greek translator read נבא instead of נברא, and understood the verse to refer to 2 Kings xiii. 21.

xlviii. 18 d. Heb. אל בנאונו (cp. Isa. xxxvii. 23 את מי ויגדף אל בנאונו); Gk. καὶ ἐμεγαλύνῃσεν ὑπερηφανίαν αὐτοῦ. Instead of אל בנאונו, the Greek seems to have read ויתגדל (cp. Isa. x. 15).

xlix. 9. Heb. וְגַם הֹזִכִּיר אֶת אִיּוֹב הַמַּכְלֵכֵל כָּל דְּרָכָיו צָדִיק, i. e. "Ezekiel also mentioned Job who observed all the paths of righteousness." As Ben Sirach had no opportunity, in his eulogy of the Fathers, to mention Job, the hero of one of the books of the Bible, it is quite intelligible that he should have mentioned him in connexion with Ezekiel, who is also only once referred to by our author (xlix. 8). The reference is to Ezek. xiv. 14. He uses, with a slight change, the expression in Ps. cxii. 5 יִכְלֹכַל דְּבָרָיו בְּמִשְׁפָּט. The Greek translator read אִיּוֹב instead of אִיּוֹב, and thought of Ezek. xxxviii, and must have divided the words הַמַּכְלֵכֵל, and have read לְכָלכֵּל. See Ezek. xxxviii. 22 אֲמַטִּיר עָלָיו. Also Syr. has אִיּוֹב. (See also Geiger's *Gesammelte Schriften*, III, 282.)

Smend (col. 165) thinks that the original reading was אֲזַכִּיר, and asserts that he has, by the aid of photography, deciphered after אִיּוֹב the letters נב, which he completes into נביא. But apart from the improbability of the title "prophet" being given to Job, אִיּוֹב נביא is grammatically inaccurate. It would have to be אִיּוֹב הַנְּבִיא.

II. *The Greek translator's misunderstandings cleared up by the text before us.*

Corruptions in the Greek text.

xxxix. 23. Heb. וְעָמָּו גִּוִּים יִירִשׁ "His wrath dispossesses nations." Cp. אֲוִירִשׁ גִּוִּים Exod. xxxiv. 24; גִּוִּים הוֹרֶשֶׁת Ps. xlv. 3. The translator understands יִירִשׁ in the sense of "cause to inherit" followed by a double accusative (cp. Job xiii. 26), and renders ὀργὴν αὐτοῦ ἔθνη κληρονομῆσαι.

xl. 9. Heb. תִּזְכְּרוּ; the Greek translator did not read תִּזְכְּרוּ but תִּזְכְּרוּ; hence γεννηθήσεσθε.

xli. 19 b. אֱלֹהִים the Greek translator read as אֱלֹהִים, and rendered it θεοῦ. The word before אֱלֹהִים is missing in the Hebrew, and the Hebrew equivalent to ἀπὸ ἀληθείας in the Greek version is no longer apparent. Possibly מִחֶמֶם

was the word (cp. חמסו תורה Zeph. iii. 4), for which the translator read מאמת.

xl. 24. שנים the Greek translator read, not שונים, but שנים, and renders it δις; also the Syriac חרין חרין.

xl. 12 d. The Hebrew read, according to the correct completion of the lacuna, מהמד עינים וכליל יופי. In the Greek version the word יפי is taken as the beginning of the next verse, ὡπαῖα.

xlvi. 3. Heb. מי הוא לפניו יחיב; Gk. τίς πρότερον αὐτοῦ οὕτως ἔστη; The Greek translator took לפניו in the temporal sense, while the true meaning is as in Joshua i. 5 "Who could stand his ground before him?" This misunderstanding necessitated the addition of οὕτως.

xli. 1 d. Gk. καὶ ἔτι ἰσχύοντι ἐπιδέξασθαι τροφήν; Heb. וְחַיֵּב אִית בִּיה חִילָּא לְמַקְבְּלוֹ חֲפִנְקָא; ועוד בו חיל לקבל תענוג. Obviously, instead of τροφήν the reading should be τροφήν. The sentence then becomes characteristic—"He is still capable of enjoying the pleasures of life."

xl. 21 b. Gk. ἕως ἔστω; Heb. אחר הוא. Hence the reading should be εἰς ἔστω.

xl. 9 b. Gk. ἐν ὑψίστοις Κύριος; Heb. בְּמִרוֹמֵי אֵל. Hence ἐν ὑψίστοις Κυρίου, as most MSS. read.

III. *Emendation of the Hebrew text, mostly with the aid of the Greek Version.*

xxxix. 17 d. Instead of אֲצִירָא read אֲצִירָא (see Ps. xxxiii. 7); Gk. ἀποδοχεῖα ὑδάτων. The last word in 17 c is certainly to be read נד, and is also derived from Ps. xxxiii. 7. יַעֲמֵד could easily turn into יַעֲרִיךְ. The whole *stichos* would therefore read בְּרַבְרָא יַעֲמֵד נד (Gk. ἐν λόγῳ αὐτοῦ ἔστη ὡς θημωνιὰ ὕδωρ); in 17 d, the original must also have been, instead of וּמוֹצֵא פִּי, (= καὶ ἐν ῥήματι στόματος αὐτοῦ).

xxxix. 21. Instead of נִבְרָא read נִבְרָא (= ἐκτίσται). Only thus does the sentence make sense: "Everything has been created for his use." Syr. עֲבִידִין. See also xxxix. 30 c, where the Hebrew נִבְרָאוֹ has also the marginal variant נִבְחָרוֹ.

xxxix. 24. Instead of לזרים read לזרים. Gk. ἀνόμοις; Syr. לרשיעי.

xxxix. 25 a must read מוב למובים חלק מראש. For חלק the Greek has ἐκτίσται; Syr. אתברית, which, however, seems to be a free rendering of חלק. The verb is used in the same sense as in Deut. iv. 19, where the Vulgate renders also חלק with "creavit" (Septuagint: ἀπένευμε).

xl. 3 a. לבנה; Gk. ἐν δόξῃ. We must therefore read לכבוד. Cp. כסא כבוד, 1 Sam. ii. 8.—Ibid. 3 b. Heb. עד לשב (marginal variant לוישב, which is recognized by the editors); Syr. ועדמא ליתבי, i.e. עד לישב; the Greek has ἕως τεταπεινωμένου, and accordingly read עד לנשפל, or, as Smend, col. 164, thinks, לשח. Cp. 1 Sam. ii. 8, from which verse also is derived the expression כסא לכבוד יושב. For עד ל . . . see Ezra ix. 4 עד למנחת ערב.

xl. 6 c. מעט מעט gives no sense whatsoever. The connexion, and also the Gk. τεθορυβημένος, suggests מרחיע, and eventually מרטיע "He is terrified by the vision of his soul." Cp. Talmud Jerushalmi Berachoth, 6 d, והרתיע מלפניו במרתיע, מפני הנחש. Of the root רטע, Levy gives only one example (following the Aruch article רטע, ed. Kohut, VII. 272 a), from the Yelamdenu: היא מרטעת.

xl. 13 a. For the unintelligible מחול אל חול the margin has the variant חיל מחיל, which the editors render "riches born of riches," which, however, does not give clear sense. The Gk. χρήματα ἀδίκων suggests the correct reading חיל מעול (see Ps. lxxi. 4), possibly originally meant to be חיל מעול (cp. הון מהבל Prov. xiii. 11). Smend adopts this reading. חיל מחיל could easily have become מחיל; this combination is reminiscent of Ps. lxxxiv. 8, מחיל אל חיל, and thus this phrase found its way into the text and became corrupted into חול. The Syriac also has נכסא דשוקרא.

xl. 20. Heb. ויין ושכר יעליצו לב; Syr. עתיקא מחדא לבא. The Syriac version, like the Targum, takes שכר to mean "old wine," and disregards ויין. Consequently, it puts for ומשניהם the singular מנה. The Greek has οἶνος καὶ μυσικαία, i.e. ויין ושיׁר. This seems to have been the original

version. "Wine and song" always go together as sources of joy. Cp. xlix. 1 c משהו על משהו, and Isa. xxiv. 9 בשיר לא ישתו יין.

xl. 18 is, in any case, a corruption of the original reading, neither does the marginal variant יותר שכל give correct sense. In the Syriac this *stichos* is absent. The Greek has ζῶν ἀνθρώπους ἐργάτου. שָׁכֵר might correspond to ἐργάτου. The verb ימתקו suggests Koheleth v. 11 מתוקה שנת חיי יָשָׁן; and if we assume that the sentence originally read חיי יָשָׁן; and if we assume that the sentence originally read חיי יָשָׁן, we obtain the Hebrew and Greek. The Greek understands יָשָׁן as the labourer resting after his task is accomplished, in the same sense as in the text just quoted from Koheleth.

xl. 27 b. For וכן כל כבוד read וְעַל כָּל כְּבוֹד; Gk. καὶ ὑπὲρ πάντων δόξαν. The entire passage is taken from Isa. iv. 5, except that חפה is substituted for חפה, with a reference to יראת אלהים. The term ערן, in the first *stichos*, makes the supposition probable that Sirach, in using חפה, also thought of the glory of Paradise, with a reference to Ezek. xxviii. 14, מסכתך. In the Midrash, בערן נן אלהים היית כל אבן יקרה מסכתך is explained as equivalent to חפה (cp. the thirty-two rules of R. Eliezer b. R. Jose Hagelili, rule 17); and Ezekiel's description is applied to the glorious tent given to the first man in Paradise.

xli. 14 a. Instead of שמעו read שמרו; Gk. συντηρήσατε. This corresponds to ver. 16 b, לא כל בשת נאה לשמור.

xli. 17. וְשָׁר, the marginal note, is better than יושב in the text adopted by the editors. Gk. καὶ δυνάστου. ושר might easily have become יושב.

xli. 19 a. For ור the word in the original text was probably נוֹל; Gk. περὶ λαοπῆς.

xli. 21 b. מחשבות מחלקות מנה in the Hebrew gives no sense. The Greek has ἀπὸ ἀφαιρέσεως μερίδος καὶ δόσεως. That would be מַחְשְׁבֵית חֶלֶק וּמַחְשֵׁב. This suits the context, and the verb מחשבת co-ordinates with the remaining verbs מחשיב (21 a, which the editors correctly substitute for מחשב), מהחריש, מהביט.

xlii. 1 f. Instead of ואל תשא פנים וחטא read ואל תשא פני חטא "Do not regard sin," in accordance with the Gk. καὶ μὴ λάβῃς πρόσωπον τοῦ ἁμαρτάνειν.

xlii. 9 d. . . . בנעוריה פן תנור ובבתוליה פן. The second *stichos*, the last word of which is missing, is translated by the editors "and in her virginity lest she be defiled." They thus seem to have conjectured תענה as the last word. But the word בנעוריה in the first *stichos* does not correspond to בבתוליה in the second; especially as the latter term occurs immediately after, at the beginning of ver. 10 a. The marginal variant has, instead of בנעוריה, בבית אביה; and, instead of בבתוליה, בבית בעלה. The same sense is given in the Gk. καὶ συνηκαυχῶ μὴ ποτε μισηθῇ; and in the Syr. ומן בעלה דלא תחתנא. The original reading was, therefore, ובבועלה "and with the married woman," which the marginal variant paraphrases with בבית בעלה. The conclusion, according to the Greek and Syriac, must have been פן תשנא (cp. Deut. xxi. 15). תשנא changed into the marginal variant תנשה (cp. Isa. xlv. 21).

xlii. 15 c. Instead of רצוני read נוצרי. Yet the margin has the reading מעשוי (= נוצרין), and this corresponds with the Gk. τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ and with the Syriac עבודיה.

xlii. 25 b. Instead of וימי read ומי, which is also tacitly assumed in the English translation.

xlii. 4 a. כור נפוח מהם מצוק gives no sense, and the translation of this passage is followed by a query. Instead of מצוק the margin has מוצק. It should probably, however, read מזהם, instead of מהם. "The furnace glows with the strong heat." The Greek and Syriac had another text.—Instead of שולה in 4 b, the original reading was certainly שלוש; Gk. τριπλασιως; Syr. חר תלתא. The sense is: "the sun heats the mountain thrice as powerfully as a furnace."

xlii. 5. ורבריו ינצח אבריו gives no sense. I propose to read ורברו ינצח אבריו "His (God's) word gives power to the wings of the sun," i.e. God's word enables the sun to traverse its path rapidly. Mal. iii. 20 also speaks of the wings of the sun (ומרפא בכנפיה). The Greek and Syriac translate in the same sense καὶ ἐν λόγοις αὐτοῦ κατέσπενσεν πορείαν; ובמלי

קדישא סרהב הלכתיה. Their text seems to have had as its last word, not אברו, but ארחו (cp. Ps. xix. 6). In the same sense נצה may be taken in ver. 13 b, ותנצה זיקות, where the Greek translates καὶ ταχύνει ἀστραπάς, describing the swift lightning. The Glossary, p. xxxiii, explains נצה as "to make brilliant." But the agreement of the two passages and the Greek version prove that the verb has the meaning "to hasten," literally "to give strength for a rapid flight." The marginal note on xliii. 13 reads ותונה יקום בל, which gives no sense. יקום is a corruption of זקום (a variant in one instance for זיקות); and ותונה is a corruption of ותונק, to be read as ויתונק, according to Deut. xxxiii. 22, and rendered in a transitive sense "to sprinkle," "to shoot forth." The verb is used in the Talmud with this transitive meaning, of the gushing forth of blood. See the examples in Levy, I, 546 a. בל is an abbreviation of במשפט.

xliii. 20 b. וברקב יקפיא מקוה (*sic* in margin; the text has מקור instead of מקוה). וברקב gives no sense. It must have probably read וברקיע "He congeals the mass of water like the firmament." The smooth, shining surface of the ice is compared to the sky. The Midrash Genesis Rabba (c. 4, beginning) represents the origin of the sky as an icy congelation of the upper waters, גלדה טפה האמצעית. Talmud Jerushalmi Berachoth, 2 c, גלד הרקיע. Cp. also Ezek. i. 2 רקיע כעין הקרח הנורא.

xliii. 23 a. מחשבתו . . שיק רבה. The editors complete the middle word תשיק and translate "burneth up." The added query is justified. In Greek the equivalent is ἐκόπασεν, this suggests תשקיע. Cp. Amos ix. 5 ושקעה.

xliii. 23 c. According to the Gk. ἐφύτευσε, the original reading was ויטע, instead of ויית. But the latter term also gives good sense, as describing the stretching forth of islands across the length and breadth of the sea.

xliii. 27. לא נוסף does not fit in with the context. Read לא נוסף "we cannot come to an end," if we wish to enumerate all the wonderful works of God. This agrees with the Gk. καὶ οὐ μὴ ἀφικώμεθα.

xliv. 4 c. The marginal variant for בספרתם is במס'. This suggests במוסרם, like the Gk. ἐν παιδείᾳ αὐτῶν. Smend thinks that the word signifies "in their scholarship." I, however, fancy that this abstract derivative from סוֹפֵר is improbable.

xliv. 4 d. במשמרות must be emended into בממשלות. ממשלות is in New Hebrew frequently used for משלים. See Levy, III, 144 a. The Syriac has בתשבחתהון, and accordingly read במוזריהם. According to my emendation, the verse would read חכמי שיה במוסרם ומושלים בממשלותם, and excellently describes the men versed in proverbs, whose aim is מוסר, and whose medium of instruction is the משל.

xliv. 8. For בנחלתם read בתהלתם; Gk. ἐπαύους; Syr. תשבחתהון.

xliv. 10. Originally read וצדקתם לא תשבה.

xliv. 18 a. Originally read ברית עולם כרת עמו.

xlv. 1. Instead of זכרו לטובה, the eulogistic addition after Moses' name, the Greek has οὗ τὸ μνημόσυνον ἐν εὐλογίαις. So also Syr. דוכרנה לבורכתא, equal to זכרו לברכה. This seems to have been the original reading. For xlv. 11, speaking of the judges of antiquity, has יהי זכרם לברכה. That is the oldest example of this formula in mentioning names of deceased. See on this subject Zunz, *Zur Geschichte und Literatur*, p. 322.

xlv. 7 d. Instead of בתועפות ראם, which gives here no sense, read במעטה תהלה from Isa. lxi. 3, where the LXX translates καταστολὴν δόξης. In this passage the Greek has περιστολὴν (var. στολὴν) δόξης. A trace of תהלה is to be found in the variant תואר.

xlv. 8 b. Instead of בבלי עץ בכבוד ועץ read בכלי עץ; Gk. σκεύεσιν ἰσχύος; Syr. במאנא דתוקפא. כלים means "garments."

xlv. 10 a. וארגמן is to be connected with the second *stichos*.

xlv. 10 c. Instead of אפוד ואזר the Greek translator had in his text אורים ותמים, which here agrees better with the context.

xlv. 12 a. מעיל between עטרת פז and מצנפת is senseless.

This garment was also named in ver. 8 c. We should therefore read *מַעַל לַמִּצְנֶפֶת* (Gk. ἐπάνω κιδάρεως), which is the same as *עַל הַמִּצְנֶפֶת מִלְמַעְלָה* Exod. xxxix. 23.

xliv. 25 c. *נחלת אש לפני כבודו* gives absolutely no sense. I propose to read *נחלת ישי לבנו לברו*, which presents a contrast to the following *stichos*, *נחלת אהרן לכל זרעו*. The sovereignty descends from father to son; the priesthood to all descendants of Aaron. See Geiger, *Nachgelassene Schriften*, III, 279. This is the sense given by the Greek and Syriac. But they translate the first two words *κληρονομία βασιλείως*, *יורשתא דמלכא*, which should therefore read *מלך נחלת*.

xliv. 26. After *ויתן לכם חכמת לב* add *עמו בצדק*. Thus the Greek. The Syriac has *לשפוט עמו בשמו*.

xlvi. 1 e. *להנקם נקמי אויב* cannot mean "to execute vengeance upon the enemy," for *נָקַם* has no plural; and *להנקם* *להנקם* would mean "to take vengeance—on behalf of the enemy," not "against the foe." Cp. *נקם* *נקם* *נקמת אויב* or *נקם אויב* Num. xxxi. 2; *ונקמתי את נקמתך* Jer. li. 36. Instead of *נקמי אויב* read *נִקְמִי א'*, and this would be equivalent to *בְּאוֹיְבֵי הַקָּמִים*, which the Greek translator renders *ἐπεγείρομένους ἐχθρούς*. The Syriac translates freely *מן נברא סנאא*.

xlvi. 7 c. Instead of *בפרע* read *בפרץ*. So also the Syr. *בִּתְּוֹרְעָתָא דְעֵמָא*. Cp. xlv. 23 d *עמו בפרץ*.

xlvii. 7 b. Instead of *בפלשתים ערים* read *ו' ב' נקם*. Cp. Ezek. xxv. 14 *ונתתי את נקמתי באדום*. The Syriac also translates thus: *וּתְּתִי אֶת נִקְמָתִי מִן פְּלִשְׁתִּיָּא*. The Greek translator renders *καὶ ἐξουδένωσεν Φυλιστινῆν τοὺς ὑπεναντίους*. He must have had *פְּלִשְׁתִּיָּא* *פְּלִשְׁתִּיָּא*.

xlvii. 11 d. Instead of *ירושלם* read, with the Greek and Syriac, *יִשְׂרָאֵל*.

xlvii. 18 c. Instead of *כברול* read, with the Greek and Syriac, *כְּבָרִיל*.

xlviii. 4 b. After *אשר*, add *מי*.

xlviii. 8. Instead of *מלא* read *מלך*. This refers to Jehu, the king who executed vengeance (Gk. ἀνταπόδομα) on the house of Ahab. Jehu was not indeed anointed by Elijah, but Elijah gave him the impulse to his work (1 Kings xix.

16). The Greek and Syriac Versions, which read מלכי, think of Hazael as well as of Jehu (1 Kings xix. 15).

IV. *Gaps in the Hebrew text supplied from the Greek or Syriac Versions.*

xxxix. 17 d. See supra, under III.

xxxix. 28 b. [ובחמתם הר]ים יעתיקו.

xl. 26 d. [ממט]ן does not suit the context. The equivalent to the corresponding Greek term (*βοήθειαν*) and Syriac (מעורנא) is עזרה. Possibly we should supply [משע].

xli. 5 b. ונכד אויל [תולדת רש]ע. In the first *stichos*, דבר רעים (variant רבת רעים) is a corruption of תולדת רעים. The Syriac has in both halves of the verse תולדתא.

xli. 20 b, 21 c. ל בעולה [א]ל [ק]יף [ש]מה [ש]ק [יף]א.

xl. 23 a. [הוא ח]י וקים [ל]עד. Syr. וחיין וקיימין לעלמין.

xl. 14 b. [ענן כרשף]. See ver. 17 c.

xl. 15. [בגדלו הנביר עננים] ל [הפיץ אבני ברד].

xl. 3 a. בדברו [אותות הסי]ר. See Exod. viii. 5, 27 ; x. 17.

xl. 13 b. ולא ל [בשם לעולם] זר.

xl. 20 d. [כי אשי יי] חלקו.

xl. 23 b. [בגבורה]ה [שלשי].

xl. 6 a. [ויפי]ל [ם] [על העם] וב [מורד האבירים].

xl. 10. [שם] ל [חגים הוד] [בכל שנה וש]נה.

xl. 11. [גם] יי' העביר פשעו.

xl. 22 c. ויתן ל [יעקב פליטה] ול [דוד ממנו שרש].

xl. 3 b. [ויורד שלש] אשות.

xl. 11. Shall he אשר ראך ומת [הוא]? [לא כ]ן היה יחיה. "That saw thee, die? Nay, he shall surely live." After the Syriac.

xl. 12. אליהו [בסער נלקח] ואלישע [נמלא רוחו].

xl. 22 d. [אשר צוה ישעיה הנביא הגדול והנאמן בחזונו].

xl. 23. [בימיו עמד השמש ויוסף על חיי המלך].

V. *Sirach's Vocabulary.*

In regard to the lexicographical peculiarities of Sirach, we must first note the circumstance that he borrows a

quantity of ready-made expressions and phrases from the Scriptures. One can say that Sirach already exhibits that mosaic style which is characteristic of the productions of the later post-Talmudical Hebrew literature. The chapters before us can furnish us with a large number of examples of this style. In the following list I omit those passages where Sirach quotes Biblical phrases, because the subjects are taken from the Bible: as e.g. the description of the high-priest's garments, &c. An example of mosaic work is the Biblical phrase used in a sense different to that it has in the original passage from which it is taken: e.g. the expression **אֵם כָּל הַי** is used of the earth, the mother of all living, while in Gen. iii. 20 it designates Eve. The most noteworthy of Biblical phrases in these chapters, used by Sirach for the adornment of style, are the following:—

- אֲבִי חַפֵּץ** xlv. 11 (Isa. liv. 12).
אֵין אוֹנִים וְחֹסֶר עֲצָמָה xli. 2 (Isa. xl. 26).
אֶרֶץ לְהַדְרִיכּוֹ עַל בְּמַתִּי אֶרֶץ xlvi. 9 (Deut. xxiii. 29; Amos iv. 13).
בְּנֵי בֶשֶׁן xlvii. 3 (Deut. xxxii. 14).
בְּרַד וְגַח לְ[יָא]שׁ xlvi. 5 (Ps. xviii. 23).
דָּם עֵנַב xxxix. 26 (Deut. xxxii. 14).
הָרִים יַעֲתִיקוּ xxxix. 27 (Job ix. 5).
זֶה חַיִּיתִי וְאִסְפָּרָה xlii. 15 (Job xv. 17).
חֶלֶב חֹטָא xxxix. 26 c (see above, Part I).
וְתַחֲלֵל אֶת יְצוּעֶיךָ xlvii. 20 (Gen. xlix. 4).
חֲזוֹן קוֹלוֹת xl. 13 (Job xxxviii. 25).
חֶרֶב נֹקֶמֶת xxxix. 30 (Lev. xxvi. 25).
חֲרָר וְחָרַב xl. 9 (Deut. xxviii. 22).
מִים עַד יָם וּמִנָּהר עַד אֲפְסֵי אֶרֶץ xlv. 21 (Ps. lxxii. 8).
וַיִּהְיֶה לְמַלְחָה מְלֻשָּׁקָה xxxix. 23 (an allusion to the destruction of Sodom; **מֻשָּׁקָה** in Gen. xiii. 10).
נָחוּ עַל מִשְׁכְּבוֹ xlvi. 19 (Isa. lvii. 2; cp. Kethuboth, 104 a).
נִין וְנֹכַד xlvii. 22; xli. 5 (Isa. xiv. 22).
עֲטַרְתָּ פֶן xlv. 12 (Ps. xxi. 4).
עַל כָּל כְּבוֹד חַפְתָּה xl. 27 (see above, Part III).
עֶפֶר וְאֶפֶר xl. 3 (Gen. xviii. 27).
שָׁבִיב אִשׁוֹ xlv. 19 (Job xviii. 5).

לחם וישבר להם מטה לחם xlvi. 2 (Lev. xxvi. 26).

ישבר xl. 9 (Isa. lx. 18).

שחק מאזנים xlii. 4 (Isa. xl. 15).

שן סלע xl. 15 (Job xxxix. 28).

That Sirach used such words, which occur very seldom, is evident from the Glossary which Driver has carefully compiled. To these words belongs also זני, plural זנים, in the sentence on Ezekiel xlix. 8, מראה ויגד זני מרכבה, יחזקאל ראה מראה ויגד זני מרכבה. Yet it is not quite clear what is meant by “divers kinds of chariots”; as there was only one divine chariot in Ezekiel’s vision, and its parts cannot be described as “kinds.” The Syriac, indeed, also read זני (ננסא דמרכבתא), but in the Greek version the word is unregarded. I believe that the original text had זיו “the glory of the chariot” (cp. the Talmudical phrase: זיו השכינה), which turned into זני.—יש, which word in xlii. 3 should have the same meaning as in Prov. viii. 21, is ambiguous. I think it probable that the *stichos* read וירשה could have become ויש. The marginal variant has, instead of ויש, וישר, into which וירש could easily have turned. The Greek has κληρονομίας ἐταίρων, and thus read נחלת רעים.

In the vocabulary of this text of Sirach, those words are especially noteworthy which are neither to be found in the Bible nor in the traditional literature, or which are used in a unique sense.

Substantives to be noticed are — זְהִירָה “brightness” (xliii. 8); תְּלִיפֹת, in the sense of “past” (xlii. 19); לָקַח, with the meaning of מָקַח (xlii. 7, where ממת ולקח is used in the sense of מִשָּׂא וּמִתֵּן, the margin has ונתת); מִטְמוֹנָה (שוואה ונתת); מִטְמוֹן “treasure” (xlii. 9); מכונה in the sense of מְכוּן (xliv. 6); נִפְי, in the sense of נִפְיוֹן (xliv. 20); תְּשֻׁלוּמוֹת as a synonym of תְּשֻׁלוּמִים (xlvi. 8).

The substantives of the form מִפְעֵל (e. g. מִנְעַל, xl. 29) are indicated by the Glossary, p. xxxii. The most prominent new word is תַּחֲלִיף = “successor” (xliv. 17; xlvi. 12; xlviii. 8), a word like תלמיד, formed after the model of abstract nouns

but designating a person (see Kaufmann, *Monatsschrift*, XLI. 837).

Of verbal forms in Hiphil are to be noted—הִשְׁרִיק “to shine with a red glow” (marginal variant on xliii. 9); הִצְהִיר, denominative of צהרים “noon” (xliii. 3). בהצהירו ירתיה חבל is not well translated “by his shining, heateth the world”; the sentence means: “When the sun shines at noon it makes the world glow.” The Greek renders it ἐν μεσημβρίᾳ αὐτοῦ. The Syriac has במצעתה דטהרה. הִצְהִיר has the same relation to צהרים as הִעָרִיב to ערב, and הִשְׁחִיר to שחר. The Hiphil form הוֹעִים, assumed by the editors in the Glossary, is contestable; for יועים, in xliii. 16, is a corruption of יוּעוּ or יודעוּ (Gk. *σαλευθήσεται*).

Hithpael forms—הִתְפַּתָּה “to allow oneself to be beguiled” (xlii. 10, margin), also in the language of the Mishna; הִתְבַּלְּלָה “to maintain oneself” (xliii. 3); הִתְחַלַּל, “to become a burden, wearisome” (xxxix. 24 “His (i.e. God’s) ways are straight to the pious but wearisome to the wicked”). Especially notable is הִתְפַּתָּה from סוד (xlii. 12), translated in the Gk. *μη συνεδρεε*; in the Syriac version חשפּר שועיתא. It signifies the same as נמתיק סוד, Ps. lv. 15; or בוא בסוד, Gen. xlix. 6.

The following Aramaisms may be mentioned:—גַּר “adultery” (xlii. 9); נָפֶה “bank” (xl. 16); עֲלֵעוּל “storm” (xliii. 18, margin); שִׁוְתָף “partner” (xli. 18; xlii. 3, margin); תִּמְהָה, plur. תִּמְהִים “wonder” (xliii. 25; xlviii. 14). An Aramaism is the phrase להשחעות בטהלתם (xlvi. 8, see above, Part III), rendered in the Syr. למשחעו על תשבחתהו. The same verb seems also to have been retained in xliv. 15 בחכמתם תשתעה, which must be emended into תשמע עדה. The Greek rendering is σοφίαν αὐτῶν διηγῆσονται λαοί (also in xliv. 8 ἐκδιηγῆσασθαι). Surprising is the absolutely Aram. מַחֲיו “to beat” (xlii. 5), for which the variant is מוֹסַר “chastisement”; מַחֲיו was probably originally a gloss.

A few more lexicographical remarks. Sirach is partial to the use of the term פְּתָב (xxxix. 32; xlii. 7; xliv. 5; xlv. 11). The expression שִׁבְכַתּ, to denote the written

law, possibly already existed in Sirach's time.—חָק (xli. 2, 3) has the special meaning of "fixed limit," "definite period," as in Job xxiii. 14; חָקִי, *ibid.* xiv. 5 (חָקוּ, *Kethib*); לַחֵק (in xl. 6 a), left untranslated, can also be explained in this way.—נִשְׁבֶּתָ (xliii. 4) is equivalent to אֶרֶץ נִשְׁבֶּתָ, as רִבָּה (xlv. 23, 25) is the same as תְּהוֹם רַבָּה. כִּרְשָׁף (xliii. 17 c) is rendered in the Greek version ὡς περὶ νεφέας; also (xliii. 14) where the lacuna is to be supplied with the term כִּרְשָׁף. Hence it, at all events, follows that the translator understood this word in the same sense as the old versions of Job v. 7. It is probable, however, that Sirach himself also uses רֶשֶׁף with the meaning of "bird," as he designates with the term "the flying clouds." The translation, "darting flashes," which is offered by the editors for xliii. 17 c, is untenable.—Instead of קִרְדָּמָה (xl. 16), the note and Glossary, p. xxxiv, have the excellent conjectural emendation קִרְדֹּמִית (see Levy, IV, 381 a). It is, nevertheless, possible that the ד is original, and קִרְדֹּמִית is an older form of the term. I infer this from the fact that קִרְדִּימָה in the Babylonian text of the Mishna Sabbath, XXII. 6, signified "reed" (in the Palestinian text פִּילֹמָה = πύλωμα is substituted); קִרְדֹּמִית can thus designate the marsh and the reed growing on it. It is even possible that Sirach, in this passage, meant by קִרְדֹּמִית the marsh or puddle itself. For the sentence reads בָּקָ' עַל גִּפְתָּ נָחַל לִפְנֵי כָל מֵטֵר נִרְעָבָה. מֵטֵר נִרְעָבָה, applied to a plant, gives no sense; for a plant cannot be "extinguished." On the other hand, the Book of Job, from which Sirach has borrowed several other unusual terms, applies נִרְעָבָה to the brook that dries up in the heat of the sun (Job vi. 17 מִמָּקוֹמָם). The meaning of the sentence under discussion would accordingly be, "As a puddle by a brook which dries up before the rain," i.e. before the rain, which supplies it with moisture, comes. The Greek and Syriac deviate widely from this text. The Syriac has the following for the second *stichos*, דָּקָם כָּל יוֹרֵק, "As a puddle by a brook which dries up before the rain," i.e. before the rain, which supplies it with moisture, comes. The Greek also read חֲצִיר for מֵטֵר.—An apparent Arabism may be noted. In two passages of our text, the verb חָלַק is found in a context which would

give it approximately the sense of "to create" (= Arab. *خلق*, *خلق*); and in both passages, the Greek as well as the Syriac version so render it: xxxix. 25 a (see above, under III) מִיב עֵסֶק גְּדוֹל חֶלֶק אֵל וְעוֹל כְּבֹד עַל בְּנֵי אָדָם י. xl. Smend assumes that חֶלֶק has the meaning "to create." Yet this view seems inadmissible; for nowhere else in the Hebrew language do we find the word with this meaning. The signification "to divide," "allot," "destine," gives good sense in both passages, which speak of the lot assigned to every human being by God. The verb has the same meaning as in xliv. 2, רַב כְּבוֹד חֶלֶק [לָהֶם] עָלֵינוּ, where the Greek also renders *ἐκτελεσεν* (Syr. *נפלו*). For the Biblical usage cp. Job xxxix. 17; and especially the use of the substantive חֶלֶק in Job xx. 29; xxvii. 13; xxxi. 2.

A point in syntax may be noted. Beside such idioms as כל מֵאֲרָץ (xl. 11), כל מֵאֶפֶס (xli. 10)—cp. חֵיל מִצֵּיִל, xl. 13 a, above, Part III—for which reference should be made to the Glossary, we find short forms after the model of יוֹם אִירָא (Ps. lvi. 4), בּוֹר הַצַּנְחָם (Isa. li. 1). See xli. 10 מִמְּקוֹם חֲגוּר; xlii. 1 דִּבֶּר חֲשֹׁמֶעַ. They harmonize with the rhythmical forms of the sayings of Sirach, which follow the model of the scriptural parallelisms which involve elliptical constructions.

W. BACHER.

March, 1897.

POSTSCRIPT.

Since the foregoing article left my hands in the middle of last March, several critical notices of the recently published fragment of Sirach have appeared. Naturally, these have dealt with some of the points discussed in my article. It is unnecessary to indicate these points in detail, but I should like to add a few remarks on some of the points which have been raised.

M. Israel Levi has devoted pp. 1-50 of the *Revue des Études Juives*, vol. xxxiv, to an elucidation of eighty-two numbered passages from Sirach, and has treated, in an admirable style, of the relations between the Hebrew text and the Greek and Syriac Versions. In no. 9 he remarks that the Syriac in xl. 20 read יִין יִשָּׁן instead of

יין ושכר. The Syriac, however, must have read שכר, for the translation חמרא עתיקא is the Targum for שכר in Num. vi. 3 and Judges xiii. 4. (Cf. Peschitto to Num. xxviii. 7.) — In no. 14 M. Levi completes xli. 19 b to בריית אלה וברית, which, however, gives no sense in the context. According to my suggestion above (II) the reading is מַחֲמִים אֱלֹהִים וברית, i. e. "(Guard thyself) against the violation — infraction — of oath and covenant." This also explains the Syriac translation מטל דמבטל (מַחֲמִים). — In no. 20 M. Levi thinks that in xliii. 30 the Greek read וברקת instead of וברקב, and translated it by *κρύσταλλος*. But ברקת is the name of a precious stone, which the Greek would not have rendered *κρύσταλλος*. I think that my suggestion above (III) is more probable. — In no. 21 M. Levi holds that in xliii. 21 b the Greek read ונוה for ינוה. As, however, the Greek has *ἀποσβέσει*, we must go further in the emendation and suppose that the Greek read יכבה. It is very surprising that Levi translates *ἀποσβέσει* by "brûle." — In no. 29 M. Levi holds that the Greek must have read בקמים אויבים, which he rightly regards as ungrammatical. But the Greek probably read בְּקָמִי אויב or בקמי אויבים (see above, III), which is in accordance with the biblical use of the Status Constructus. Two co-ordinate nouns are combined by the use of the construct state. (Thus בת ציון הבתולה = בתולת בת ציון : so also, בקמי אויבים = באויבים הקמים.) — In no. 34 M. Levi thinks that the Greek read ויגדף for ויגדל. I have discussed the point above (I). — In no. 78 M. Levi holds that אם כל חי in xl. 1 c, to which I have above called attention as an example of the mosaic style of Sirach, is not an original reading, though the Greek has *μητέρα πάντων*. I think this opinion untenable, and that the original reading was indeed אם כל חי, and not ארץ כל חי. Sirach had Job i. 21 in his mind, ערום יצאתי מבטן אמי וערום אשוב שמה — where the mother's body and the earth in which man is received after death are connected in idea. It is thus no foreign figure to picture the earth as the "mother of all things." The whole verse in Sirach, מיום צאתו, is closely parallel to the passage which I have cited from Job. — In no. 82 M. Levi explains xlv. 25 c d as I have done above (III), but he cannot make sense of the words נחלת אש. My view, that the original reading was נחלת ישי, I will not support by a reference to Isaiah xi. 1, ינוע ישי. Perhaps one might call to mind the passage in 2 Sam. xx. 1, 1 Kings xii. 16 ולא נחלה לנו בבן ישי.

Prof. S. Fränkel (*Monatsschrift*, XLI, pp. 380-384) has also called attention to the substantival adjectives in Sirach, e. g. נושבת (= "ארץ נו") and רבה (= "ג' רבה"). Of בהצהירו xliii. 3, his explanation agrees with

mine. Well worthy of note is Fränkel's suggestion that the Greek translator, in rendering יִנְצֶה, xliii. 5, by κατέσπευσεν, thought of נָחַץ (see above, III). Moreover, Fränkel believes that in the Greek of xliii. 19 the translator had before him כָּסִיר instead of כִּסְפִיר. According to Levi, no. 19, the original word was כִּסּוּפִי, but this is philologically untenable.

In the *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes*, XI, 95-103, Dr. Felix Perles has made some interesting remarks on the Hebrew text of Sirach. He thinks that נִשְׁבַּחַת, xliii. 4, is an imitation of the Greek οἰκουμένη, but the expression is purely Hebraic. It is an abbreviation of the phrase אֶרֶץ נִשְׁבַּחַת in Exod. xvi. 35, which is the opposite of אֶרֶץ לֹא נִשְׁבַּחַת in Jer. vi. 8.—With regard to a verse from an earlier portion of Sirach than is in the fragment (III, 21) frequently quoted in the Talmud and Midrash, Perles remarks that the original Hebrew was not עֵסֶק בְּנִסְתָּרוֹת but תוֹעֵלָת בְּנִסְתָּרוֹת, because the Greek translation is χρεία τῶν κρυπτῶν. But, as a matter of fact, in xlii. 23 b of our fragment, צָרַךְ corresponds with the Greek χρεία, and it is probable that the translator read צָרַךְ instead of עֵסֶק, the two words being closely alike in shape. The original is certainly עֵסֶק, for this alone gives a good sense. Cf. עֵסֶק בְּתוֹרָה. Prof. J. H. Müller in his remarks on Perles' article, *ibid.*, p. 103-105, also considers עֵסֶק the original reading.

In an article on the word תְּחִלִּיף in the *Monatsschrift* (XLI. 337-340), Prof. Kaufmann also discusses xlviii. 8 of Sirach. He, too, considers מֶלֶךְ is the right reading instead of מֶלֶא, but his explanation of תְּשִׁלוּמוֹת is not tenable, for even though Elisha could be anointed by Elijah as his successor in his own stead, it cannot be said that Jehu, who was to be anointed king by Elisha, can be regarded as a substitute for the dynasty of Ahab which Jehu was to destroy. מֶלֶךְ תְּשִׁלוּמוֹת really means "king of retribution," i. e. the king who is called to take retribution on the house of Ahab. In the choice of this word Sirach was probably influenced by 2 Kings ix. 26, where Jehu, when he is beginning the slaughter of the house of Ahab, quotes a prophetic oracle which he heard on the occasion of the judicial murder of Naboth. In this oracle the words occur: וְשִׁלַּמְתִּי לָךְ בְּחִלְקָהּ הַזֹּאת. The word תְּשִׁלוּמוֹת has the same meaning as שְׁלֹמָה Hos. ix. 7, Ps. xci. 8, שְׁלֹמִים Isa. xxxiv. 8.

מֶלֶךְ תְּשִׁלוּמוֹת is a combination such as מֶלֶךְ הַמִּשְׁפָּט, the "king who exercises justice."

W. BACHER.

BUDAPEST, June, 1897.

THE WORD תחליף IN ECCLUS. XLIV. 17.

WE should like to be allowed to point out that Prof. Kaufmann's polemic, in the May number of the *Monatsschrift*, against the rendering of this word by "successor," rests on a misunderstanding. "Successor" in English means more than merely a "follower": it means one who *takes the place of another, fills the same dignity, holds the same position, and carries on the same office*. Thus we meant by "successor" exactly what Prof. Kaufmann understands by תחליף, and if we had been writing a commentary we should have explained the term in exactly the same way. The note in the Glossary (p. xxxv) clearly showed what we understood by the word. The corresponding Hebrew verb (החליף) is there explained, not by *follow*, but by *cause to come in place of* (cf. Kaufmann, p. 339, "an die Stelle des Vorgängers treten"), *make to succeed*, and the corresponding Syriac word by *substitute, representative* (cf. Kaufmann, "Ersatz," "Stellvertreter"). Neither of these words could, however, have been used as a *translation* of תחליף in any of the three passages in which it occurs. Before Prof. Kaufmann decides that "das neue Wort mit einem Uebersetzungsfehler zur Welt gekommen sei," let him find a word which will represent it—not of course in German, but in *English*—better than "successor," or (in xlvi. 12) "succeed."

The difficulty in "filled with retribution" (xlvi. 8) we do not perceive. If Micah can say he is filled with judgment (iii. 8), why cannot Jehu, in view of 2 Kings ix, x, be said to be filled with retribution? We greatly doubt the sense in which Prof. Kaufmann would understand מלך תשלומות: in New Hebrew, תשלום means "Ersatz," not in the sense of *substitution*, but in the sense of *requital, repayment, compensation* (as in such phrases as תשלומי נזק, Schadenersatz, נפטר מן (ה)תשלומין); in the Targums, also, תשלומא is "Vergeltung" (in a good sense) in 2 Sam. xix. 37, and תושלמא is "Vergeltung" (in a bad sense) in Is. xxxiv. 8 and elsewhere. A "king of substitutions," in the sense of a king succeeding another king, seems to us a most forced and questionable rendering of מלך תשלומות; and if we adopted the marginal reading מלך, we could only understand it in the sense of a "king of requitals or retributions" (the plural being naturally intensive).

PROF. SMEND'S EMENDATIONS.

IN the *Theologische Literaturzeitung* (May 15, 1897) Professor Smend gives the result of a very careful examination of the Oxford Sirach-fragment, which he made in the spring of this year. Every one interested in the establishment of the new text will be glad to have

the benefit of Prof. Smend's skill and experience, although they may not always be able to accept his conclusions. Disregarding emendations (with which we are not at present concerned), the passages in which the changes are proposed are naturally in parts of the MS. which are defaced and extremely difficult to read. In such cases, often the only hope is in a happy conjecture. When once the right reading is divined, it is frequently possible to see on the MS. that it *is* right, but the final appeal must always be to the MS. itself. Prof. Smend, however, lays very great stress on the readings of the photographs, as having been taken before the MS. was *washed* (*gewaschen*). While it is true that photography often affords considerable aid in the decipherment of effaced MSS., yet it may be accepted as an axiom that its evidence is unsound unless supported by the original. In other words, there must be in the MS. some traces of the reading which is preserved more clearly in the photograph. The present MS. is no exception to the rule. After being photographed it was not *washed*—a process which is never applied to MSS. of this kind—it was *cleaned*, as far as possible, by removing dust, &c., with a soft brush or duster, and then the whole surface was covered with transparent paper. Therefore whatever has disappeared from the MS. since it was photographed can have been lost only by the accidental breaking off of minute fragments where the paper was brittle. Although the thin paste necessary to affix the transparent paper may possibly have caused the ink to run in some places, and thus rendered the reading difficult, it is impossible that, where the surface remains intact, letters should have totally disappeared. In the interest, therefore, of those who have not the opportunity of consulting the MS. for themselves, we have made a thorough examination of all the passages challenged (comparing the photographs), and now give a list of (a) corrections to which we agree without reserve, (b) passages in which we are unable to accept Prof. Smend's reading, (c) passages in which certainty is impossible, and where, therefore, we cannot either accept or reject without hesitation.

(a) The following corrections we accept without reserve: xl. 26 a, יגיל for . . . יגב (but see under b). xl. 26, margin, נא קול written as two words. xli. 21 a, margin, מי הישע is written as two words. xli. 21 b, . . מהש for . . מהש. xli. 21 c, . ומהי for . ומהי. xlii. 3 a, before חובר a ב is crossed through. xlii. 9 c, after תגור a ר crossed through. xlii. 10 c, תונה was our conjecture; see the translation. xlii. 23 a, margin, וקים for יקים. Prof. Smend's completion of this line (הוא ה[י] ועומ[ה] ל[עדר]) is certainly favoured by such traces of letters as remain. xlii. 14 d, omit the ל: it is probably only taken off from the next page. xlii. 15 a, margin, חשמע for חשנה. xlv. 9, margin,

אירר for אורר (so also Prof. Bevan in the *Athenæum* for April 3, 1897). xlv. 23 b, נהל after בנבורה. xlv. 13 e, [דבר] ב for [ביא] נ. xlvii. 10 b, שנה, as we translate. xlvii. 12 a, בעבור אין for בעבור, but we should now reject the [ו] at the beginning. xlvii. 15 a, 7 . . . 3. ארץ כסית. xlvii. 23 f, אשר חטא והחטיא (or perhaps ויחטיא) (see also under c). xlviii. 12 d, ונלמד בכל for ומופתים כל.

(b) The following readings we cannot see our way to accepting: xl. 19 c, שגר for עוגר. xl. 22, [פי ונע] מ; but [עם וי] פ would be possible. xl. 26 a, ללב, יגילל[ו] ללב, but we agree to ללב, or better הלב (see also under a). xl. 26 margin, we find no trace of מי before גופת, although we have supplied it. xl. 26 d, מעין for [מטמ] אן: the י is not possible: even the ך is doubtful: the word looks like מ. ש. מ. xli. 1 b מעונתו for מוכנתו. xli. 2 b אננים (proposed since the article was in print) for אונים. xli. 19 d margin, ממועט (also proposed later) for ממנע; but we agree that the נ is doubtful. xlii. 9 b, after חפ nothing is certain: the remnants of עש (whence Prof. Smend's ש תפריע), which are visible on the photograph, are really parts of the first two letters of בשאול (xli. 4 d) showing through the hole in the paper. xlii. 10 b the completion לה חשלה would no doubt fit the space, but the clause depends on פן, and לא therefore gives an entirely wrong sense: moreover ט is quite uncertain¹. xlii. 10 d margin, line 3, after חע not מ' but ש' in the common shortened form ש'. xlii. 24 b, שיש[איר] איר: we agree that שיש is more probable than שש: then there are traces which seem to be parts of a מ or ב, then possibly one more letter, after which the paper is perfectly clean and fresh: we see no signs of איר: שישאיר also yields a bad sense, and would be the only instance in the fragment of the use of the relative ש. xliii. 1 b, the ר in רבים appears certain: לה (i.e. להבים?) is not possible. xliii. 7 b, חופץ עופה: the word after וחפץ seems to be שנה: there is a mark about the middle of the נ which gives it, at first sight, the appearance of a פ, but it is a flaw in the paper and not made with the pen. xlv. 20 b, בבריתת. xlv. 13 a, the י is there. xlv. 13 c, הווא בן: there is no sign of ו, nor room for it between ה and א: א ב or כ is possible after הא. xlv. 20 a, א. ק. before ל. xlv. 23 b, שליש. xlv. 6 b, כנען. xlvii. 11 a, גם: we originally supplied this obvious particle at the beginning, but abandoned it, as no traces of the letters remain. xlvii. 23 a, מיעש. xlvii. 23 b, בן מנן: we see no traces of any but the last letter, which may be a ך. xlviii. 11 b [אש] רי: we find no signs of אש. xlix. 7 b, להשיב: we cannot accept this, but allow that our reading ולהעז is doubtful: the remains of the letters are fairly clear,

¹ We mentally supplied [א היר]; see translation.

but their form is peculiar. xlix. 10 d, וישענורו: we read וישענורו rather doubtfully.

(e) In the following cases the reading is uncertain: xl. 10 margin, ויבשכר, for the unmeaning נבשכר, is possible. xl. 22, [יע]מירו for [יח]מירו: of the letters supplied only dots at the top of the line remain, which may belong to ע rather than to ח. xl. 24 a, [ו]ש[ותה], after אח, is probable. xli. 1 a, יברך for זכרך: the כ (ב) is not very well defined: the ז, though doubtful, is not impossible. xli. 4 d, חיים perhaps belongs to the text; perhaps a ל (but not על) stood before it. xli. 5 a, margin, כן for בן. xli. 6 b, ורש is improbable: our זרע is doubtful: it is, however, possible that no letters are wanting before זרע. xli. 15 b, margin, perhaps מַשְׁמִין, but the word is crossed through and very doubtful. xli. 21 a, מהשב. xlii. 5 c, ממהיר ממהר¹. ממהיר ממהר: the horizontal line of the ר is not visible, as the paper is cracked, but the down-stroke which remains might have formed part of a ר: of the first מ (in ממכר) nothing remains, there being a hole in the paper: the second מ is doubtful: the next letter is more like ב than כ: the ר is very probable: the next letter was originally a ר which has been altered or crossed out, but ת is very doubtful: the ג might be a נ: the ר is probable. xlii. 10 c, margin, חעצר for חש[מ]ה: the ר is above the line, as Professor Smend points out: the letter before has a long tail, perhaps תעקר². xlii. 10 d, the last word may perhaps be חעצר. xliii. 1 a, ך. ך may be only taken off from the next page. xliii. 23 a, עשיק: more probably תשיק. xliii. 32 a, ק for ך is very doubtful. xlv. 3 a, the MS. has חר, but the ח may be a ה blotted: מהר is probable. xlv. 12 d, ך עי[ן] וּמ, the ך עי[ן] are possible, but uncertain. xlv. 13 a, [פנ]י[הן], ל is more probable than [פנ]י[הם]. xlv. 13 b, ועד עולם for ... ל[א]ל. ועד is only possible if the paper has been pressed together; the space is insufficient for עולם: the remnants look more like גילם. xlv. 20 c, ת[רומות], ר for ר. xlv. 15 a, דרוש for דרוש: the רוש is probable: the remnants of the first letter are more like פ (פרוש). xlvii. 9 a, ח at the end. xlvii. 10 d, ירנן for ירנן: the lower half of the doubtful letter (whether י or נ) is

¹ We should naturally be glad to be rid of the strange form ממחוי: at the same time, however, the marginal מיכר is distinctly connected, by the usual circle, with the word which was so read by us.

² We doubt עצר in the sense *close the womb*: we have עצרני מלרע Gen. xvi. 2, *hath shut me up from bearing*, עצר כל רחם Gen. xx. 18, *hath shut up all the wombs*, and, where the limitation is apparent from the immediate context, Isa. lxi. 9 ויעצרוני; but do these cases justify the absolute use of העצר *shut up*, in the sense of *have the womb closed*? Would it, used alone, suggest more than *be detained or imprisoned* (Jer. xxxvi. 5, 2 Kings xvii. 4)? For עקר, cf. the New-Hebrew use (Levy, s.v. no. 2).

lost. xlvii. 11 c, חק ממלכת for חקת מל': the words are very close together, and the ת (or מ) is uncertain: we originally read חק מל', but eventually decided for חקת מל' after much hesitation, although ממלכת in the absolute state occurs in xlvi. 13 e, and although מלכת would naturally be written in the MS. מלכות. xlvii. 20 c we supplied להביא, but find nothing of the word left: the same remark applies to xlvii. 23 f, ישראל. xlviii. 11 a, after מות probably nothing followed. xlix. 9 a, נשיא after איוב: the paper is so much discoloured that we cannot be sure of any marks. xlix. 11 a, perhaps מיה at the beginning, but very uncertain¹.

THE EDITORS OF THE HEBREW TEXT
OF ECCLESIASTICUS.

A NOTE ON THE TEXT AND INTERPRETATION OF
ECCLUS. xli. 19.

A WELL-KNOWN Rabbinical term for God is מקום=place. It has hitherto been difficult to fix the date when this remarkable usage originated. Frequent in the Mishna, it is quite unknown in Biblical Hebrew. The question which the present note raises is this: Was it employed by Ben Sira?

The question is suggested by the marginal text of xli. 19 a, which reads זר ממקום ונייר על זר; the line is dependent on ברש of v. 17 and can hardly be translated in any other way than "(Be ashamed) before God and a prince of pride." Our question, in the first instance, resolves itself into a consideration of the relative values of the two readings here offered by the newly discovered MS. It is recognized by the editors of the Hebrew MS. that the marginal notes give "the variants of another copy of Sirach, or more probably of two other copies" (p. xii). A glance at these very numerous variants suffices to show that in some cases they represent the better text; though a thorough comparative examination of all of these would be necessary in order to determine whether as a whole the best text is that which the MS. presents in full, or one or other of the texts which are represented in the marginal readings. It must suffice for present purposes to recognize that the marginal notes are genuine variants.

I hope to show that there are the strongest possible exegetical reasons against the reading of the Hebrew text in xli. 19 a; that these do not hold against the reading of the margin; and that

¹ In xlix. 10 b, when it was too late to introduce the correction, Prof. Driver pointed out that there is not room in the MS. for ממקום[ח] and that ממח[ח] should be supplied; cf. the Syriac and xlviii. 13.

therefore, on exegetical grounds, the marginal reading must be considered superior to that of the text.

The line in question occurs in the short section (xli. 14-xlii. 5) headed "The discipline of Shame," and in particular in a sentence or sub-section extending from xli. 17-19a, which, together with the four preceding verses, is omitted in the Syriac Version. These verses run thus in the *marginal* text:—

מנשיא ושר על כחש	17 בוש מאב ואם על פחז
מערה ועם על פשע	18 מאדון וגברת על שקר
19 ממקום ונגיד על זר	משותף ורע על מעל

The lines may be rendered thus—

Be ashamed before father and mother, of wantonness,	before a prince and a governor, of a lie.
Before master and mistress, of deceit,	before the congregation and the people, of transgression ;
Before a companion ¹ and a friend, of trespass,	before <i>makom</i> and a prince, of pride.

It will be observed that we have here six symmetrically constructed clauses : in each case we have two terms expressing persons in whose presence shame ought to be felt, followed by one term expressing a course of conduct of which to be ashamed. This symmetry is broken twice¹ by the Hebrew *text*, once with and once without the support of the LXX and the Old Latin. In 17 b, probably no one will dispute that the Hebrew *text* (מנשיא יושב אל כחש = Before a prince sitting (in judgement) of a lie) has arisen from an earlier text still found in the Hebrew margin and underlying the Versions by ordinary transcriptional error, ושר having become יושב and על, אל. In 19 a, the Hebrew *text* has (in the main)² the support of the Versions (LXX and Old Latin) in reading וממקום תגור על זר = And before the place where thou sojournest, of a stranger. But here, as in 17 b, I believe the text reading to have resulted in transcription from the marginal (תגור from ונגיד, and זר from זר); but in this case the transcriptional corruption took place earlier—before instead of after 132 B.C., the date of the Greek translation. The text reading involves—(1) the extraordinary construction בוש ממקום = to be ashamed before a place, (2) the breaking of the symmetry of the clauses, (3) a most improbable isolation in respect of construction for this single clause,

¹ In 18 c the first word is undecipherable in the text, but the י of ורע, which is fairly clear, indicates that a parallel term preceded.

² For the last word זר the Versions appear to have had something different; LXX (A B) has κλοπήs = theft, and so Old Latin: LXX in α—πλοκήs.

which would agree as little with those which follow as with those which precede; for, as the preceding (five) clauses are identical in structure, so are several that follow, an action of which to be ashamed being in these introduced by **בִּן**. The sense, moreover, of the whole clause "Be ashamed before the place where thou sojournest of a stranger" is unnatural. These objections, as it appears to me, would have justified a condemnation of the text as corrupt, even had no variant existed.

Dismissing the Hebrew text then as erroneous, we are left with these alternatives—(1) the clause is a later insertion; (2) although **בִּן** is nearer the original than **מִקוֹם**, it is itself a corruption of the real text, in which some other personal term occupied the place of **מִקוֹם**; (3) the Hebrew marginal reading is the original, and Ben Sira therefore used **מִקוֹם** as a term for God.

The first alternative has in its favour that it occurs in a section omitted by the Syriac. The significance of this can only be rightly estimated in the light of a thorough study of the relative value of the texts of the Hebrew and the Versions; but it must be borne in mind that the Syriac Version of Ecclesiasticus is characterized by the absence of long sections. The second alternative does not carry us far: for the Greek translation was made in 132 B.C., and we should therefore have to refer the usage of **מִקוֹם**=God sufficiently far back to admit of **בִּן** becoming corrupted in transcription into **מִקוֹם** by the year 132.

The difficulty of the third alternative is unquestionably serious. We should certainly not have expected so early and isolated an instance of the usage of **מִקוֹם** for God. It would apparently be quite isolated; for there is no other trace of the usage in the Hebrew fragment, nor any clear suggestion of it by the Versions in those parts of the book of which the Hebrew has not been recovered. The Greek *τόπος*, the regular equivalent of **מִקוֹם**, occurs eight times in chaps. i-xxxviii. 14, viz. in iv. 5; xii. 12; xiii. 22; xvi. 3, 14; xix. 17; xxvi. 18 (N, A); xxxviii. 12. In most of these cases it is perfectly manifest from the context that **מִקוֹם** was not used of God; in iv. 5 and xvi. 14, such a usage may have occurred in the original and been misunderstood by the translators, but even in these cases the supposition is unnecessary and improbable.

The isolation of the instance in xli. 19, if the marginal reading be correct, must then be admitted. The next point to be considered is the earliest subsequent usage.

The term **מִקוֹם**, used of God, is already frequent in the Mishna, i.e. four centuries later than Ben Sira. If, however, we are willing

to rely on the accuracy of the Rabbinical oral tradition, not merely for the substance of the early sayings, but for minute points of phraseology in them, we can carry the usage much further back than the period at which the Mishna was completed. It occurs in a saying attributed to Simon ben Shetakh, who lived about 100-70 B.C., and which runs as follows: *מה אעשה לך שאתה מתחטא לפני המקום ועושה* (Taanith 3, 8). This would carry the usage back to within about a century of Ben Sira.

If we are not prepared to base much on this tradition, then we have to bear in mind that there is but very little extant Hebrew literature of the period of four centuries between Ecclesiasticus and the completion of the Mishna, and what there is (Daniel, Esther, and some Psalms) belongs to the earliest part of it.

The indirect evidence next falls to be considered; and of this the most important is Philo's use of *τόπος*. In his discussion of Gen. xxviii. 11 (*ὑπήντησεν ἐν τῷ τόπῳ*), Philo says "God is himself called 'place' (*τόπος*), because whereas he embraces the universe (*τὰ ὅλα*), he is embraced by nothing at all, and because he is the refuge (*καταφυγή*) of all, and forasmuch as he is himself the room which he occupies (*ἐπειδήπερ αὐτός ἐστι χώρα ἑαυτοῦ*), containing himself and resembling himself alone. . . . Now the deity being embraced by nothing is of necessity his own place." *De Somniis*, § 11, Mangey, I, 630). The full significance of this passage only appears when we compare it with the explanation of *ויפגע במקום* in Genesis Rabbah¹:—*רבי הווא בשם רבי אמי אמר מפני מה מכנין שמו של הקב"ה וקוראין אותו מקום שהוא מקומו של עולם ואין עולמו מקומו מן מה דכתיב הנה מקום אתי הוי הקב"ה מקומו של עולם ואין עולמו מקומו א"ר יצחק כתיב מעונה אלהי קדם אין אנו יודעים אם הקב"ה מעונו של עולמו ואם עולמו מעונו מן מה דכתיב י' מעון אתה הוי הקב"ה מעונו של עולמו ואין עולמו מעונו.* The points of contact between the Philonean and the Hebrew Midrashic explanation are too numerous to be accidental; both introduce the explanation in connexion with the same passage: "And he lighted on a place" (Gen. xxviii. 11), both give the same

¹ c. LXVIII. (ed. Berlin I. 125 b, top).—The first part of the above-quoted passage is referred by R. Isaac Solomon to Ben Sira; see JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW, III, p. 706 and no. 64, in the list of quotations prefixed to Cowley and Neubauer's edition of the Hebrew text. Mr. Schechter very reasonably suggests that the reference by R. Isaac Solomon is merely apparent, ב"ר the marks of citation for *בראשית רבה* having become corrupted into ב"ר, the abbreviation of *ב"ר*. The error might have been facilitated if it was known that Ben Sira actually used *מקום* in the sense of God.

reason, although the Hebrew interpretation is a little terser—"God is called place because he is the place of the world, but the world is not his place"; and both connect with the discussion the fact that God is also called מַעַן, καταφυγή, i.e. refuge (Ps. xc. 1), although the mode of connexion is different: in Philo, the fact that God is a καταφυγή τῶν συμπτάντων is part of the reason for the term τόπος; in the Midrash, the statement about מַעַן is co-ordinate with that about מְקוֹם. We must, therefore, conclude either that the Hebrew explanation of "place" as a name of God is derived from Philo¹; or that the explanation contained in the Midrash Rabba, although attributed to a comparatively late Rabbi (circ. 275-300 A.D.), is of much more ancient Palestinian origin. In the latter case, the usage of מְקוֹם is certainly prior to Philo's tract *De Somniis*, and consequently very nearly, if not quite as early as the beginning of the Christian era. But even in the former case, the usage, though not the explanation, may have originated in Hebrew: and this at least seems more probable, for Philo appears to discuss τόπος as a borrowed term rather than as one of his own creating. On the whole, the balance of probability is in favour of referring the usage of מְקוֹם for God, at least as far back as the beginning of the Christian era, i.e. about two centuries after Ben Sira.

Two points indirectly affecting our question call for briefer notice.

(1) Parallel in some degree to the usage of מְקוֹם, under consideration, is that of שָׁמַיִם = heavens for God. This also is frequent in the Mishna; in the Gospel of St. Matthew, too, the phrase "the kingdom of heaven" is the regular equivalent of "the kingdom of God," which is used in the Gospel of St. Luke. But unlike מְקוֹם, שָׁמַיִם as a term for God can be traced back to the Old Testament literature; it there occurs once and once only, viz. in Dan. iv. 23 מְנִדֵּי תִנְרַע דִּי שְׁמַיָּא = From the time that thou recognizest that the heavens govern (cf. v. 22 עַד דִּי תִנְרַע דִּי שְׁלִיט עֲלֵיא). The usage is as isolated in Daniel and in Biblical Hebrew as the usage of מְקוֹם in Ecclesiasticus would be. On the other hand we can trace it sooner and more clearly subsequently: it occurs several times in 1 Maccabees (certainly in iii. 50, cf. ver. 51; iv. 10, 24), which dates from about 100-70 B.C. (2) The Hebrew text confirms the accuracy of the Greek in a passage (xliii. 27) which had been questioned on the ground of its supposed pantheistic character. That either this sentence (וְקֵץ הַדְּבַר הוּא הַכֹּל) or the usage of מְקוֹם implies pantheism,

¹ We should possibly have a parallel for this in the Targumic use of מִיכְרָא for God, which Schürer (*Gesch. d. jüd. Volkes*, II. 879, n. 15) thinks to be most probably derivative from the Philonic use of λόγος.

in any strict sense of that term, is highly questionable: but the thought of the sentence is certainly akin to that which appears to have given rise to the term.

To sum up; the reading of the Hebrew text is improbable; the strong exegetical objections to it outweigh the support of the LXX and the Old Latin. The reading of the Hebrew margin, on the other hand, yields an excellent sense, perfectly maintains the symmetry of the section to which it belongs, and by familiar transcriptional errors would pass into the form found in the Hebrew text. The only objection to it is the use of מִקִּים. That objection is certainly weighty: for the usage is quite isolated in Ecclesiasticus, and cannot be traced with absolute certainty till nearly four centuries later. On the other hand, Rabbinical oral tradition carries the usage back to within a century of Ben Sira; the parallel use of τόπος in Philo most probably implies the use of מִקִּים as early at least as the beginning of the Christian era, and in the general lack of extant Hebrew literature between Ecclesiasticus and the Mishna the failure to establish the usage directly cannot be pressed. Further, the somewhat parallel use of "heaven" for God is found quite isolated in Daniel, written within twenty years of Ben Sira, and lastly, there are traces in Ecclesiasticus of that kind of thought out of which the usage of מִקִּים would naturally grow.

G. BUCHANAN GRAY.